UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/533,802	05/04/2005	Yeong-Chun Lee	PIP-101 4567	
AQUILLA PATENTS & MARKS, PLLC 221 COE HILL ROAD CONTERN HARRON, NH 02226, 2605			EXAMINER	
			LEE, CLOUD K	
CENTER HARBOR, NH 03226-3605			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3753	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/07/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

tracy@aquillapatents.com info@aquillapatents.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/533,802	LEE, YEONG-CHUN				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	CLOUD K. LEE	3753				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 Ma</u>	av 2008					
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
	/ 					
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>5-11</u> is/are pending in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>5-11</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite				

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

DETAILED ACTION

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanamori (JP 2000-170222A) in view of Plyler et al (US Patent No. 5,884,661).

Kanamori discloses a water service box comprising a case (8a), a soft tube (22), a water tap (12) and a valve plate (8b), the soft tube protected by the corrugated tube (23) through a reducing socket (25b) and the other end of the flexible hose connects and fastens with the water tap (12), a friction projection (the surface of the valve place 8b is considered the friction projection) and a socket insertion hole (8n) formed on the valve plate, a rim member (see 8n) around the socket insertion hose.

Kanamori fails to disclose a built-in flexible hose connecting a soft tube, one end of the flexible hose connects and fastens with the soft tube.

Plyler et al. discloses a built-in flexible hose (14) connecting a soft tube (24), one end of the flexible hose connects and fastens (by fitting 20) with the soft tube (24) for providing a flexible fluid conduit to facilitate the relative movement and maintain leak-tight communication between the flexible hose and the soft tube. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided a built-in flexible hose as taught by Plyler et al connecting the soft tube of Kanamori in order to provide a flexible fluid

Art Unit: 3753

conduit to facilitate the relative movement and maintain leak-tight communication between the flexible hose and the soft tube as taught by Plyler et al.

2. Claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanamori (JP 200-170222A) in view of Plyler et al as applied in claims 5-6, and further in view of Kanazuki (JP 408033160A).

The combination of Kanamori and Plyler et al. discloses the water tap fixed with the plate (8) through a socket insertion hole (8n), however, Kanamori fails to disclose an access plate.

Kanazuki discloses a maintenance hole (see figure 1, near element 7), an access plate (17) and a rim member (7) around the maintenance hole. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided an extra plate with an extra access hole on a valve plate, (in this case, Kanazuki provides an access plate (17) with an access hole (near element 7)) in order to provide an easy access to the flexible hole for maintenance purposes.

3. Claim 11 (as understood) is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanamori (JP 200-170222A) in view of Plyler et al. and Kanazuki (JP408033160A) as applied to claims 5-10 above, and further in view of Mulvey et al (US Patent No. 6,106,027).

The combination of Kanamori, Plyler et al. and Kanazuki fails to disclose the flexible hose furnished with coil springs inside or outside of the flexible hose.

Mulvey et al disclose a coil spring (see Col 4 lines 6-17 and element 110) around the flexible hose (114). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time

Art Unit: 3753

the invention was made to have provided a coil spring around the flexible hose in order to provide an additional reinforcement for the flexible hose (see Col 4 lines 6-17).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 5 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In response to applicant's argument that Kanamori reference fails to disclose a water tap, the Examiner respectfully disagrees for the following reason. A water tap has been interpreted as a water outlet from a pipe, therefore, the end (26a) of Kanamori reference meets the claimed invention.

In response to applicant's argument that Kanamori reference fails to disclose a flexible hose built-in as an integral part, it is noted that the limitation "a flexible hose is build-in as an integral part" is not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van* Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CLOUD K. LEE whose telephone number is (571)272-7206. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

Art Unit: 3753

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Huson can be reached on (571)272-4887. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John Rivell/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3753

CL